

February 25, 1975

I think it is far less than a coincidence that on the very day that this hearing was held relative to bidding and the offering of public bids, Plattsmouth had a bond issue in excess of two million dollars which was duly advertised, notices were sent by the persons involved to over 200 bidders and I will give you one guess how many bids were received in this noble offer to those who would advocate strict bidding and I will tell you that the answer was one and that the proponents of this bill were not that one bidder. That one bidder was a coalition of the bond dealers in the state of Nebraska. This, in contrast to the testimony of one of the expert proponents of the bill who said, properly advertised, you would be getting 15 to 18 bids and a very wide range of variation. Over two million dollars, the day of the hearing, one bid.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I was one of the persons who supported Senator Savage's move to raise the bill from Committee. I did it because I wanted additional discussion and acknowledgement of some of the testimony that had been delivered at the Committee hearing. I have received since that time, of course, numerous pieces of correspondence, some laudatory and some otherwise, in regard to the raising of the bill. That does not make that much difference except that it was good to hear from persons who were interested, both pro and con. I would just like to dispel the notion that there is any particular brand of immunity from lobbying on any one bill. We have, of course, lobbyists both pro and con and that is the right and the duty of those persons who would support a bill or who would oppose a bill. That is what we have to come to expect in this body. We do not hear, perhaps, as much as all of us would like to hear from the general public. I think that, perhaps, I would hope, at least, those persons who have indicated that they were chagrined that the bill had been raised from Committee would not feel that way. I would suggest that certainly the issue of public bidding is not a new one. Public bidding is accepted in some manner or another in both the state of Iowa and the state of Kansas. It has not damaged the integrity of those institutions or subdivisions of government. I had an appointment this morning in my office with a friend of mine, at 6:30 by the way, who felt concern enough about his opposition to the bill to come down to see me at that time. We discussed it at great length. He did give me information which I had not had before and which I was pleased to receive but I would like to point out only one thing in regard to the adopted amendment. First of all, the \$100,000 portion was deleted at the request of some persons who said perhaps they could support the bill, if that were removed. It was not removed by Senator Savage in an attempt to further handicap any subdivision of government. He did it, I am sure, as he indicated to me because there were indications from persons who felt that it should be removed. Now secondly, I want to read the amendment, Section 3. It is very specific. It says the governing body may reject any and all bids. If no bids are received or if all bids are rejected, the governing body may either readvertise the bonds or sell them at a private negotiated sale. It is very specific. It does not say you must accept the low bid. It does not say that there is a certain time or anything of that nature. It says, may reject any or all bids. If they decide to negotiate, they can do so. As Senator Dworak has pointed out, the only